

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD**

(ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

WEDNESDAY THE EIGHTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND SIX

: PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE **L. NARASIMHA REDDY**
CONTEMPT CASE No. 1044 OF 2006

Between:-

Chikuluri Narsimha S/o. C. Durgaiah.

..Petitioner.

AND

1.Mr. Prem Chandra Reddy, District Collector, R.R. District, at
Lakdikapool,
Hyderabad.

2.Mr. Rajendhar, Mandal Revenue Officer, Quthbullapur (M), R.R. District.

..Respondents.

Contempt Case filed under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to punish the respondents for willful and deliberate violation of the judgment and decree in OS.No. 302 of 2002 dated 02-05-2003 on the file of Junior Civil Judge, Medchal, R.R. District;

The Contempt Case coming on for hearing upon perusing the Case and the affidavit filed herein and the order of the High Court dated: 18-10-2006 made herein and upon hearing the arguments of Sri B.Mahender Reddy, Advocate for the petitioner and of and of the Govt. Pleader for Revenue on behalf of respondents, the Court made the following **ORDER:-**

"Heard Sri A. Satya Prasad, learned Senior Counsel for the Government.

He places reliance upon a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in R.N. Dey v. Bhagyabati Pramanik ((2000) 4 SUPREME COURT CASES 400).

The matter needs to be verified.

***Prima facie*, even the Supreme Court had observed that the power of the High Court under the Contempt of Courts Act, can be exercised to uphold the dignity and majesty of the Courts.**

In the instant case, the decree for perpetual injunction, in favour of the petitioner, became final and the respondents cannot act contrary to it, such a course would amount to eroding the dignity and majesty of the Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite the pendency of the contempt case and operation of the decree, the respondents are trying to induct third parties into possession.

Pending further orders, it is directed that respondents 1 and 2 shall ensure that the petitioner continues to be in possession of the suit schedule property.

Post the C.C. on 17.11.2006 in the motion list."

DEPUTY
REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

OFFICER.

To

1.Mr. Prem Chandra Reddy, District Collector, R.R. District, at
Lakdikapool,
Hyderabad.

2.Mr. Rajendhar, Mandal Revenue Officer, Quthbullapur (M), R.R. District.

(Addressees1 & 2 by R.P.A.D)

3.Two CCs to the Govt. Pleader for Revenue, High Court of A.P., Hyd
(OUT).

4. One CC to B.Mahender Reddy, Advocate(OPUC).

5. One spare copy.

TKK

HIGH COURT

LNR.J

DATE: 08-11-2006.

ORDER

C.C. NO. 1044 OF 2006

DIRECTION.

**DRAFTED BY TKK
DT.9-11-2006.**

HIGH COURT

LNR.J

DATE: 08-11-2006.

**Note :- Post the C.C. on 17-11-
2006 in the Motion List.**

ORDER

C.C. NO. 1044 OF 2006

DIRECTION.

